



PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 05725.0978

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Gilles RUBINSTENN et al.)	Group Art Unit: 2624
)	
Application No.: 10/024,495)	Examiner: Manav SETH
)	
Filed: December 21, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 4461
)	
For: FEATURE EXTRACTION IN)	
BEAUTY ANALYSIS)	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER BOARD RULE § 41.37

This is an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("the Board") from the Office Action dated January 5, 2007 ("Office Action"), rejecting claims 1-8 and 10-37, in the above-referenced patent application. Appellants submit this Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and enclose herewith the required fee of \$500.00 under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2).

A Notice of Appeal was filed on March 1, 2007, and this Appeal Brief is being filed concurrently with a petition for a two-month extension of time and the appropriate fee.

06/25/2007 HBELETE1 00000067 10024495

02 FC:1402

500.00 0P

I. Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is L'Oréal S.A., the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the application, as indicated by assignment duly recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 012882, Frame 0928 on May 28, 2002.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellants, Appellants' legal representatives, and Assignee are not aware of other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings that may be related to, directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-8 and 10-37 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 6, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36 being independent. (Claim 9 was cancelled previously.)

Claims 1-8 and 10-37, as set forth in the Claims Appendix, were rejected in the Office Action, and the rejections applied to those claims are at issue in this appeal.

IV. Status of Amendments

No amendments have been filed subsequent or in response to the Office Action.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A. Independent Claim 1

The subject matter set forth in claim 1 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16.¹ The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. During the identifying, the image is processed to identify substantially all visible occurrences of the skin condition in the image. Page 3, lines 11-15. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the skin condition. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The method further comprises displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable. Fig. 3C; Fig. 5, ref. 508; Fig. 14; page 12, line 19 to page 14, line 4; page 28, line 22 to page 29, line 3.

¹ The citations to the specification and drawings should not be interpreted as indicating that the claims are limited to any of the embodiments and examples set forth in the specification and/or drawings. Moreover, these citations are not necessarily exhaustive.

B. Independent Claim 6

The subject matter set forth in claim 6 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The skin condition includes one or more wrinkles. Fig. 2, ref. 206; Fig. 3B, ref. 306, page 6, line 22; page 8, line 17 to page 9, line 8. During the identifying, the image is processed to identify substantially all visible wrinkles in at least one part of the image. Page 3, lines 11-15. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the visible wrinkles. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable. Fig. 3C; Fig. 5, ref. 508; Fig. 14; page 12, line 19 to page 14, line 4; page 28, line 22 to page 29, line 3.

C. Independent Claim 22

The subject matter set forth in claim 22 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features

enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition to an extent that the subject is anonymous when the representation is viewed. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises displaying the representation such that the subject is anonymous. Fig. 3C; Fig. 5, ref. 508; Fig. 14; page 12, line 19 to page 14, line 4; page 28, line 22 to page 29, line 3.

D. Independent Claim 24

The subject matter set forth in claim 24 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the skin condition. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the

representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The skin in the received image is covered with powder to facilitate extracting the representation. Page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 7.

E. Independent Claim 25

The subject matter set forth in claim 25 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the skin condition. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The skin in the received image is illuminated with a Woods lamp to facilitate extracting the representation. Page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 7.

F. Independent Claim 27

The subject matter set forth in claim 27 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy. The method comprises receiving an image of the subject's skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling

substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. During the identifying, the image is processed to identify substantially all visible occurrences of the skin condition in the image. Page 3, lines 11-15. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the skin condition. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The method further comprises displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable. Fig. 3C; Fig. 5, ref. 508; Fig. 14; page 12, line 19 to page 14, line 4; page 28, line 22 to page 29, line 3.

G. Independent Claim 29

The subject matter set forth in claim 29 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis. The method comprises receiving an image of a subject's skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted

representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The skin in the received image is covered with powder to facilitate extracting the representation. Page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 7.

H. Independent Claim 30

The subject matter set forth in claim 30 relates to a method of performing a skin analysis. The method comprises receiving an image of a subject's skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18. The skin in the received image is illuminated with a Woods lamp to facilitate extracting the representation. Page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 7.

I. Independent Claim 32

The subject matter set forth in claim 32 relates to a system for performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy. The system comprises a first memory for storing an image of the subject's facial skin. Fig. 6, ref. 608; page 3, line 20 to page 4, line 4; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 10. The stored image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The system further comprises a processor. Fig. 5, ref. 510; page 8, lines 4-17; page 13, lines 1-8; page 25, line 18 to page 26, line 7. The processor is configured to identify one or more skin conditions in the image. Fig. 1, ref. 52; Figs. 2, 3B; Fig. 7, ref. 704; Fig. 12; page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 8; page 13, lines 16-20. The processor is further configured for extracting from the image one or more representations of the skin condition to protect the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 9, line 9 to page 11, line 20. The system further comprises a second memory. Fig. 6, ref. 608; page 3, line 20 to page 4, line 4; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 10. The second memory is for storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18.

J. Independent Claim 33

The subject matter set forth in claim 33 relates to a method of protecting an identity of an individual providing a body image. The method comprises instructing the subject to capture one or more images containing information for use in skin analysis and information unrelated to skin analysis, including facial features that enable

substantial identification of the subject's identity. Fig. 1, ref. 50; Figs. 2, 3A, 6; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises providing software for modifying the image to remove the information unrelated to the skin analysis to protect the subject's identity during transmission. Fig. 1, ref. 54; Fig. 3C; Fig. 7, ref. 706; Fig. 14; page 8, line 4 to page 11, line 20. The method further comprises receiving the modified image over a network. Fig. 3C; Fig. 5, ref. 512; Fig. 6, ref. 612; Fig. 14; page 7, line 18 to page 8, line 3; page 12, line 11 to page 14, line 4. The method further includes performing a skin analysis on the modified image. Fig. 7; page 11, lines 8-20; page 14, line 15 to page 15, line 5.

K. Independent Claim 34

The subject matter set forth in claim 34 relates to a method of performing a hair analysis. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's hair. Figs. 2, 3A; page 3, lines 2-7; page 6, lines 14-18; page 7, lines 5-17; page 13, lines 9-16. The method further comprises identifying one or more hair conditions in the image. Fig. 7, ref. 704; page 3, lines 2-7; page 6, lines 14-18; page 8, lines 4-17. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the hair condition. Fig. 7, ref. 706; page 3, lines 2-7; page 6, lines 14-18; page 9, line 9 to page 10, line 1. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18.

L. Independent Claim 36

The subject matter set forth in claim 36 relates to a method of performing a nail analysis. The method comprises receiving one or more images of a subject's nails.

Page 3, lines 11-16; page 6, lines 14-18; page 7, lines 5-17. The method further comprises identifying one or more nail conditions in the image. Fig. 7, ref. 704; page 3, lines 11-16; page 6, lines 14-18; page 8, lines 4-17. The method further comprises extracting from the image one or more representations of the nail condition. Fig. 7, ref. 706; page 3, lines 11-16; page 6, lines 14-18; page 9, line 9 to page 10, line 1. The method further comprises storing information reflective of the representation. Fig. 1, ref. 56; Fig. 7, ref. 714; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18.

VI. Grounds of Rejection

A. Claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,003 to Hillebrand et al. ("*Hillebrand*").

B. Claims 24 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hillebrand* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,253,086 to Szwarcbier ("*Szwarcbier*").

C. Claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,749 to Gutkowicz-Krusin et al. ("*Krusin*") in view of *Hillebrand*.

D. Claims 24 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krusin* in view of *Hillebrand* and further in view of *Szwarcbier*.

E. Claims 25 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krusin* in view of *Hillebrand* and further in view of "Ultraviolet Radiation," EHC Journal 160, 1994, 2nd edition ("*EHC*").

F. Claims 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 5,308,609 to Etheredge, III ("*Etheredge*") in view of *Hillebrand*.

VII. Argument

A. **Rejection of claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on *Hillebrand* should be reversed**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand*. Under U.S. patent law as interpreted by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“the Federal Circuit”), “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim in found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Under the Federal Circuit’s exacting standards of anticipation, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Id.* (quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

1. **Independent claim 1**

Appellants respectfully submit that *Hillebrand* fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method including, among other things, “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than at least one skin condition.” *Hillebrand* does not disclose or suggest at least these features recited in claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that *Hillebrand* purportedly discloses the recited “extracting . . .” at col. 2, lines 7-14; Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 39-53; Figs. 5-8; col. 6, lines 1-8;

col. 7, lines 17-28; col. 8, lines 20-45; and Figs. 11-13. See Office Action, pp. 3-4.

Hillebrand teaches that “the system electronically **determines** a sub-image of the first digital image of the face of the person” (col. 2, lines 7-9, emphasis added), “the controller . . . **determines** which area(s) of the image to analyze” (col. 4, lines 45-47, emphasis added), “additional sub-images may be **determined**” (col. 7, lines 28-29, emphasis added), and “if the sub-image contains six red spots . . . then six locations in the sub-image are **determined**” (col. 8, lines 25-27, emphasis added). Accordingly, *Hillebrand* relates to **determining** the location of defects in an image, without providing any teaching or suggestion of “**extracting** from the . . . image at least one representation . . . [that] includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than . . . [a] skin condition,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). (In Appellants’ patent application, Figs. 3C and 14 are exemplary skin condition images extracted from Figs. 3A and 13, respectively, and devoid of substantially all facial features for the purpose of “maintaining a subject’s privacy,” as recited in claim 1.) *Hillebrand* does not mention any “skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features, and none of *Hillebrand*’s images shown in the *Hillebrand* drawings (Figs. 5, 7, and 11-14) is “devoid of substantially all facial features,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* does not teach or suggest “**extracting** from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image **devoid of substantially all facial features other than at least one skin condition**,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons provided above, *Hillebrand* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. *Hillebrand* thus fails to anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 6

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 6.

Claim 6 recites “extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the visible wrinkles.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 6 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to anticipate claim 6. The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

3. Independent claim 22

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 22.

Claim 22 recites “extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject’s facial skin, wherein extracting occurs to an extent that the subject is anonymous when the representation is viewed.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 22 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to anticipate claim 22. The rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

4. Independent claim 27

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 27.

Claim 27 recites “extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 27 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to anticipate claim 27. The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

5. Independent claim 32

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 32.

Claim 32 recites a system comprising a “processor configured . . . for extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition to thereby protect the subject’s identity.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “processor configured . . . for extracting . . .” of claim 32 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to anticipate claim 32. The rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

6. Independent claim 33

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 33.

Claim 33 recites “providing software for modifying the at least one image to remove at least some of the information unrelated to the skin analysis, thereby protecting the subject’s identity.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “providing software for modifying . . .” of claim 33 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to anticipate claim 33. The rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

7. Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31

Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6, and 27. Because *Hillebrand* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6, and 27, dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 are allowable over *Hillebrand* at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims 1, 6, and 27. Accordingly, the rejection of

dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hillebrand* is improper and should be reversed.

B. Rejection of claims 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Hillebrand* and *Szwarcbier* should be reversed

The Examiner rejected independent claims 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hillebrand* in view of *Szwarcbier*. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, neither *Hillebrand* nor *Szwarcbier*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature of claims 24 and 29.

1. Independent claim 24

Claim 24 recites a method including, among other things, “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 24 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that *Szwarcbier* teaches “us[ing] powder on the skin before taking the image.” Office Action, p. 11. Regardless of whether the Examiner’s characterization of *Szwarcbier* is correct, *Szwarcbier* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *Szwarcbier* also does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 24. Therefore, *Hillebrand* and *Szwarcbier*, taken alone

or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every recitation of claim 24.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 29

Claim 29 recites a method including, among other things, “extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject.”

Hillebrand does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 29 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that *Szwarcbier* teaches “us[ing] powder on the skin before taking the image.” Office Action, p. 11. Regardless of whether the Examiner’s characterization of *Szwarcbier* is correct, *Szwarcbier* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *Szwarcbier* also does not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 29. Therefore, *Hillebrand* and *Szwarcbier*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every recitation of claim 29. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

C. Rejection of claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* should be reversed

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krusin* in view of *Hillebrand*. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined)

must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, neither *Krusin* nor *Hillebrand*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature of claims 1-8, 10-23, 26-28, and 31-33.

1. Independent claim 1

Claim 1 recites, among other things, “receiving at least one image . . . , wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity.”

The Examiner alleged that *Krusin* at the abstract; Figs. 6(a) and (d); col. 4, lines 13-16; col. 6, lines 1-55; col. 8, lines 23-30 and 52-55; and col. 11, lines 25-30 discloses the recited “receiving . . .” of claim 1. Office Action, p. 11. Contrary to that allegation, *Krusin* does not disclose any image “includ[ing] facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity,” as recited in claim 1. For example, the images of *Krusin*’s Figs. 6(a) and 6(d) do not include any facial features, and identification of the subject’s identity from those images alone is virtually impossible. Other portions of *Krusin* also do not disclose any image “includ[ing] facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, *Krusin* does not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” of claim 1. Furthermore, *Hillebrand* fails to cure this deficiency of *Krusin*. Accordingly, *Krusin* and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites “extracting from the . . . image at least one representation of at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

The Examiner alleged that *Krusin* at Figs. 6(a)-6(f), 7(a)-7(f), and 8(a)-8(h) teaches the “extracting” step of claim 1. *See* Office Action, p. 13. Contrary to that allegation, Figs. 6(a), 6(d), 7(a), 7(d), 8(a), and 8(e) of *Krusin* appear to be already devoid of substantially all facial features, rather than being the result of any “extracting.” Therefore, even assuming that the segmentation and clean up process that changed Figs. 6(a), 6(d), 7(a), 7(d), 8(a), and 8(e) into Figs. 6(c), 6(f), 7(c), 7(f), 8(d), and 8(h), respectively, could constitute the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 1, which Appellants do not concede, *Krusin* still fails to teach or suggest “extracting from the at least one image [including facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity] at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition,” as recited in claim 1. In *Krusin*, because the starting images (Figs. 6(a), 6(d), 7(a), 7(d), 8(a), and 8(e)) of *Krusin* are already devoid of facial features, no extraction of a representation of a skin condition image devoid of facial features is necessary. Therefore, *Krusin* does not teach or suggest “extracting from the . . . image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features,” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, *Hillebrand* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Krusin* because *Hillebrand*, as discussed above, does not teach or suggest “extracting from the . . . image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons provided above, *Krusin* and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 6

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 6.

Claim 6 recites “receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the visible wrinkles.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 6 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness

has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

3. Independent claim 22

Krusin and Hillebrand, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 22.

Claim 22 recites “receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject’s facial skin, wherein extracting occurs to an extent that the subject is anonymous when the representation is viewed.”

Krusin and Hillebrand, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 22 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

4. Independent claim 27

Krusin and Hillebrand, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 27.

Claim 27 recites “receiving an image of a portion of a subject’s skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin

condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 27 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

5. Independent claim 32

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 32.

Claim 32 recites a “first memory for storing an image of at least a portion of a subject’s facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and a “processor configured . . . for extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition to thereby protect the subject’s identity.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “first memory” and “processor” of claim 32 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

6. Independent claim 33

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 33.

Claim 33 recites “instructing a subject to capture at least one image . . . containing . . . information unrelated to a skin analysis, including facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “providing software for modifying the at least one image to remove at least some of the information unrelated to the skin analysis, thereby protecting the subject’s identity.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “instructing” and “providing” of claim 33 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

7. Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31

Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6, and 27. Because *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6, and 27, dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 are allowable over *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims 1, 6, and 27.

Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 26, 28, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

D. Rejection of claims 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *Szwarcwier* should be reversed

The Examiner rejected independent claims 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krusin* in view of *Hillebrand* and further in view of *Szwarcwier*. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *Szwarcwier*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 24 and 29.

1. Independent claim 24

Claim 24 recites a method including, among other things, “receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand* do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 24 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that *Szwarcwier* teaches “us[ing] powder on the skin before taking the image.” Office Action, p. 11. Regardless of whether the Examiner’s characterization of *Szwarcwier* is correct, *Szwarcwier* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *Szwarcwier* also does not teach or

suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 24. Therefore, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand* and *Szwarcwier*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 24. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 29

Claim 29 recites a method including, among other things, “receiving an image of a portion of a subject’s skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable in the at least one image” and “extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand* do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim and 29 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that *Szwarcwier* teaches “us[ing] powder on the skin before taking the image.” Office Action, p. 11. Regardless of whether the Examiner’s characterization of *Szwarcwier* is correct, *Szwarcwier* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *Szwarcwier* also does not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 29. Therefore, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand* and *Szwarcwier*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not

been established, and the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

E. Rejection of claims 25 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *EHC* should be reversed

The Examiner rejected independent claims 25 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krusin* in view of *Hillebrand* and further in view of *EHC*. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *EHC*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 25 and 30.

1. Independent claim 25

Claim 25 recites a method including, among other things, “receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject’s facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject’s identity” and “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition.”

Krusin and *Hillebrand* do not teach or suggest the recited “receiving . . .” and “extracting . . .” of claim 25 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that *EHC* “clearly teaches that Woods Lamp emits ultraviolet light and is further used in skin analysis.” Office Action, p. 22. Regardless of

whether the Examiner's characterization of *EHC* is correct, *EHC* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *EHC* does not teach or suggest the recited "receiving . . ." and "extracting . . ." of claim 25. Therefore, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *EHC*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 25. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 30

Claim 30 recites a method including, among other things, "receiving an image of a portion of a subject's skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable in the at least one image" and "extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject."

Krusin and *Hillebrand* do not teach or suggest the recited "receiving . . ." and "extracting . . ." of claim 30 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that *EHC* "clearly teaches that Woods Lamp emits ultraviolet light and is further used in skin analysis." Office Action, p. 22. Regardless of whether the Examiner's characterization of *EHC* is correct, *EHC* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Krusin* and *Hillebrand* discussed above. That is, *EHC* does not teach or suggest the recited "receiving . . ." and "extracting . . ." of claim 30. Therefore, *Krusin*, *Hillebrand*, and *EHC*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and

every feature of claim 30. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

F. Rejection of claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Etheredge* and *Hillebrand* should be reversed

The Examiner rejected claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Etheredge* in view of *Hillebrand*. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, neither *Etheredge* nor *Hillebrand*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature of claims 34-37.

1. Independent claim 34

Claim 34 recites a method including, among other things, “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one hair condition.” A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, among other things, neither *Etheredge* nor *Hillebrand*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 34.

Regarding claim 34, the Examiner acknowledged that *Etheredge* “does not explicitly teach . . . extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one hair condition”; however, the Examiner argued that *Hillebrand* “discloses a system which . . . extracts each skin condition so that each condition is being analyzed.” See Office Action, p. 23. Appellants disagree with the Examiner’s

allegation relating to *Hillebrand*. As explained above with respect to claim 1, *Hillebrand* relates to **determining** the location of defects in an image, but *Hillebrand* does not teach or suggest **extracting** a representation of a condition from an image. Therefore, *Hillebrand* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Etheredge*.

For at least the reasons provided above, *Etheredge* and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 34. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

2. Independent claim 36

Claim 36 recites a method including, among other things, “extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one nail condition.”

Etheredge and *Hillebrand*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited “extracting . . .” of claim 36 for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

3. Dependent claims 35 and 37

Dependent claims 35 and 37 depend from independent claims 34 and 36, respectively. Because *Etheredge* and *Hillebrand* fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 34 and 36, dependent claims 35 and 37 are allowable over *Etheredge* and *Hillebrand* at least by virtue of their dependence from

allowable base claims 34 and 36. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

G. Conclusion

For the reasons provided above, all of the pending claims 1-8 and 10-37 are allowable over the cited references. The Board is therefore respectfully requested to reverse the outstanding rejections so that those pending claims may be allowed.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this Appeal Brief, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Andrew J. Vane
Reg. No. 45,174
for By: _____
Anthony M. Gutowski
Reg. No. 38,742

Dated: June 22, 2007

VIII. Claims Appendix

1. A method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy, the method comprising:

receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

identifying in the at least one image at least one skin condition, wherein during identifying, the at least one image is processed to identify substantially all visible occurrences of the at least one skin condition in at least one part of the at least one image;

extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition;

storing information reflective of the at least one representation; and

displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the stored information includes an image of the at least one skin condition.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the stored information includes a quantification of the at least one representation.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein the quantification indicates at least one of an extent, intensity, frequency, type, and severity of the at least one skin condition.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one skin condition includes at least one wrinkle.

6. A method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy, the method comprising:

receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

identifying at least one skin condition in the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin, the at least one skin condition including at least one wrinkle,

wherein during identifying, the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin is processed to identify substantially all visible wrinkles in at least one part of the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin;

extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the visible wrinkles; and

displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein the visible wrinkles are represented in the extracted representation by marks mirroring contours and locations of the visible wrinkles.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein wrinkle depth is reflected in the extracted representation by at least one of mark intensity, color, and visual cue.

9. (Canceled).

10. The method of claim 1, wherein during receiving, the at least one image is obtained in digital form.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein during identifying, a computer processor is used to perform an image processing function.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one skin condition includes at least one of skin pore size, texture, elasticity, dryness, cellulitis, sweating, aging, wrinkles, melanoma, exfoliation, desquamation, homogeneity of color, micro-circulation, shininess, softness, smoothness, hydration, sebum production, cleanliness, irritation, redness, vasomotion, vasodilation, vasoconstriction, pigmentation and freckles.

13. The method of claim 1, wherein storing includes saving the at least one representation at a geographical address separate from a geographical address of the at least one image.

14. The method of claim 1, further comprising instructing the subject on how to record the at least one image.

15. The method of claim 14, wherein instructing includes advising the subject on how to capture the at least one image with an image capture device.

16. The method of claim 15, wherein the image capture device is a digital camera.

17. The method of claim 14, wherein instructing includes advising the subject on how to capture the at least one image using a scanner.

18. The method of claim 1, further comprising associating personal information about the subject with the information reflective of the at least one representation.

19. The method of claim 18, wherein the personal information includes at least one of physical characteristics, lifestyle information, family history information,

vocational information, environmental information, genetic information, and information correlated to the at least one skin condition.

20. The method of claim 19, performed on a plurality of subjects, the method further comprising maintaining a searchable database for correlating personal information of the plurality of subjects with skin conditions of the plurality of subjects.

21. The method of claim 3, wherein the quantification is tracked over time.

22. A method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy, the method comprising:

receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

identifying at least one skin condition in the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin;

extracting at least one representation of the at least one skin condition from the at least one image of the at least one portion of the subject's facial skin,

wherein extracting occurs to an extent that the subject is anonymous when the representation is viewed; and

displaying the representation such that the subject is anonymous.

23. The method of claim 1, wherein during extracting at least one portion of the at least one image is magnified to facilitate identifying the at least one skin condition.

24. A method of performing a skin analysis, the method comprising:
receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;
identifying in the at least one image at least one skin condition;
extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition; and
storing information reflective of the at least one representation,
wherein skin in the received image is covered with powder to facilitate extracting the at least one representation.

25. A method of performing a skin analysis, the method comprising:
receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the at least one image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;
identifying in the at least one image at least one skin condition;

extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition; and
storing information reflective of the at least one representation,
wherein skin in the received image is illuminated with a Woods lamp to facilitate extracting the at least one representation.

26. The method of claim 1 conducted, at least in part, in a network environment, wherein receiving at least one image occurs via a network and in at least one location remote from a location of the subject.

27. A method of performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy, the method comprising:

receiving an image of a portion of a subject's skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

identifying in the image at least one skin condition, wherein during identifying, the at least one image is processed to identify substantially all visible occurrences of the at least one skin condition in at least one part of the at least one image;

extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all facial features other than the at least one skin condition;

storing information reflective of the at least one representation; and

displaying the skin condition image such that the subject is substantially unidentifiable.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein during extracting at least a portion of the at least one image is magnified to facilitate identifying the at least one skin condition.

29. A method of performing a skin analysis, the method comprising:
receiving an image of a portion of a subject's skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable in the at least one image;
identifying in the image at least one skin condition;
extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject; and
storing information reflective of the at least one representation,
wherein skin in the received image is covered with powder to facilitate extracting the at least one representation.

30. A method of performing a skin analysis, the method comprising:
receiving an image of a portion of a subject's skin, wherein the subject is substantially identifiable in the at least one image;
identifying in the image at least one skin condition;

extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition, wherein the extracted representation includes a skin condition image devoid of substantially all features that identify the subject; and

storing information reflective of the at least one representation,

wherein skin in the received image is illuminated with a Woods lamp to facilitate extracting the at least one representation.

31. The method of claim 27 conducted, at least in part, in a network environment, wherein receiving an image occurs via a network and in at least one location remote from a location of the subject.

32. A system for performing a skin analysis and maintaining a subject's privacy, the system comprising:

first memory for storing an image of at least a portion of a subject's facial skin, wherein the image includes facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

processor configured to identify in the image at least one skin condition and for extracting from the image at least one representation of the at least one skin condition to thereby protect the subject's identity; and

second memory for storing information reflective of the at least one representation.

33. A method of protecting an identity of an individual providing a body image, the method comprising:

instructing the subject to capture at least one image of at least one portion of the subject, the image containing information for use in a skin analysis and information unrelated to a skin analysis, including facial features enabling substantial identification of the subject's identity;

providing software for modifying the at least one image to remove at least some of the information unrelated to the skin analysis, thereby protecting the subject's identity during transmission;

receiving the modified image over a network; and

performing a skin analysis on the modified image.

34. A method of performing a hair analysis, the method comprising:

receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's hair;

identifying in the at least one image at least one hair condition;

extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one hair condition; and

storing information reflective of the at least one representation.

35. The method of claim 34 conducted, at least in part, in a network environment, wherein receiving at least one image occurs via a network and in at least one location remote from a location of the subject.

36. A method of performing a nail analysis, the method comprising:
receiving at least one image of at least one portion of a subject's nails;
identifying in the at least one image at least one nail condition;
extracting from the at least one image at least one representation of the at least one nail condition; and
storing information reflective of the at least one representation.

37. The method of claim 36 conducted, at least in part, in a network environment, wherein receiving at least one image occurs via a network and in at least one location remote from a location of the subject.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.